

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 remain pending, with claims 1 and 9-11 being independent. Claims 1-5 and 9-11 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, in Figures 8 and 9, at page 20, lines 11-27 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-11 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagashima (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0122202). Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashima in view of Ett (U.S. Patent No. 5,227,893).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9-11 so as to clarify features of the invention that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. To this end, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an image processing apparatus that comprises, among other things, first and second input units, a registration unit, a printing unit, a designation unit, a scanning unit, an index input unit, a selecting unit, and a control unit. Amended independent claims 9-11 recite analogous features.

One feature of the claimed invention is that both application data and print data generated from the application data are registered in a database in correspondence with a specific index.

Further, either the application data or the print data is selected based on an input specific index derived from a predetermined code on a printed material, and in accordance with a designated output method. Therefore, according to the invention, suitable data and an output method of the data can be determined without any specific user instructions for selecting the data and output method.

The Office Action cites Nagashima as disclosing some of the features of the invention. With respect to the features of the invention related to the inputting a specific index and selecting data based on the specific index, the Office Action cites Nagashima's coversheet template producing section 1071 and coversheet template selecting process shown at S4 in Figure 3.

The coversheet template producing section 1071 is described at paragraphs 0060-0069 of Nagashima. Meanwhile, the coversheet template selecting process of Nagashima appears to be most-fully described at paragraph 0074 of the reference. In this regard, Nagashima does not provide specific details how a template is selected, but appears to indicate at paragraph 0095 that the selection is simply based on a user's instruction. In any event, the coversheet template producing section and coversheet template selection process of Nagashima do not include multiple aspects of the input specific index and selection features of the claimed invention. For example, neither of the coversheet template producing section nor the coversheet template selection process of Nagashima includes scanning printed material on which a predetermined code is printed, analyzing the predetermined code, inputting the specific index corresponding to the analyzed predetermined code, and then making a selection based on the input specific index, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Applicant also submits that Nagashima does not disclose an information processing apparatus that includes a printing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1. In this regard, the Office Action cites Nagashima's client 1000 as "an image processing apparatus," and printers 2000 and 3000 as a "print unit." In amended independent claim 1, however, the claimed information processing apparatus is recited as including a print unit that is configured to print an image on a sheet based on print data. On the other hand, in Nagashima, the client 1000 and the printers 2000 and 3000 are separate devices, with the client 1000 transmitting data to the printers by a communication network 4000. See Fig. 1. Thus, Applicant submits that Nagashima cannot be understood to disclose or suggest the information processing apparatus with a print unit, as now recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the secondary citation to Ett does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Nagashima. Ett is cited in the Office Action as disclosing a pseudo code bar form in a facsimile image that contains indexing/routing information. Notably, the routing information of the pseudo code bar in Ett is used to route the image to a recipient image station. See col. 6, lines 4-30.

Applicant submits, however, that Ett does not disclose or suggest the features of the invention that are lacking in Nagashima, as discussed above. In particular, Ett does not disclose or suggest the features of the invention related to the input specific index and selecting data based on the specific index, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Nagashima and Ett, whether taken individually or collectively, fail to disclose or suggest the invention recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Applicant further submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 5219975_1